

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

ENITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/621,719	07/16/2003	Chien-Wei Li	H0005056	1571
75	90 05/05/2005		EXAMINER	
Honeywell International, Inc.			MCNEIL, JENNIFER C	
Law Dept. AB2 P.O. Box 2245			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
Morristown, N.	07962-9806		1775	
			DATE MAILED: 05/05/200	5

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)					
Office Action Summan	10/621,719	LI ET AL					
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit					
	Jennifer C. McNeil	1775					
The MAILING DATE of this communication Period for Reply	n appears on the cover sheet v	vith the correspondence addres	is				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR F THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICAT - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 C after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communicat - If the period for reply specified above, is less than thirty (30) days - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ION. FR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a on. , a reply within the statutory minimum of the period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MC statute, cause the application to become A	reply be timely filed irty (30) days will be considered timely. NTHS from the mailing date of this commu NBANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	nication.				
Status	•						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on	16 July 2003.						
· ·	This action is non-final.						
<u>, </u>	☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is						
closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.							
Disposition of Claims							
4) Claim(s) <u>1-39</u> is/are pending in the applic	eation	•					
	4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>23-38</u> is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.	narawii nom oondaarada.						
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-22 and 39</u> is/are rejected.							
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.							
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction a	and/or election requirement.						
Application Papers	•	•					
	i						
9) The specification is objected to by the Exa		hytho Eversiner					
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)	· · · ·	•					
Applicant may not request that any objection to		• •	404(-1)				
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the call. 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the call.	•	•	` '				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119							
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for fo	eroign priority under 25 LLS C	& 110(a) (d) or (f)					
a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority docu 2. Certified copies of the priority docu 3. Copies of the certified copies of the	ments have been received.	Application No	20				
_ ·	•	n receiveu in this National Sta	je.				
application from the International B * See the attached detailed Office action for	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	at received					
Coo the attached detailed Office action for	a list of the tertified copies fit	K 1000IVOU.					
Attachment(s)							
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview	Summary (PTO-413)					
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-94 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/97 Paper No(s)/Mail Date		o(s)/Mail Date Informal Patent Application (PTO-152	<u>'</u>)				
· apor recognition bate		 ·					

Application/Control Number: 10/621,719

Art Unit: 1775

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- I. Claims 1-22, and 39, drawn to a coating, classified in class 428, subclass 701.
- II. Claims 23-28, drawn to a method of forming a coating, classified in class 427, subclass252.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions I and II are related as process of making and product made. The inventions are distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) that the process as claimed can be used to make other and materially different product or (2) that the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process (MPEP § 806.05(f)). In the instant case the product may be made by reacting the tantala and alumina at the time of deposition, as in CVD.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

During a telephone conversation with Michael Shimokaji on April 22, 2005 a provisional election was made without traverse to prosecute the invention of Group I, claims 1-22, and 39. Affirmation of this election must be made by applicant in replying to this Office action. Claims 23-38 are withdrawn from further consideration by the examiner, 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a non-elected invention.

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of

Art Unit: 1775

inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 8 states that the composition consists essentially of AlTaO₄. How can the coating essentially consist of this when at least one metal oxide is also added to the coating, as per claim 1?

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

- (a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.
- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1, 2, 6-18, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Chakrabarti et al (US 5,802,091). Chakrabarti teaches a coating comprising an oxide of tantalum and aluminum. The ratio of alumina to tantala may be 50:50 in which the coating is considered to form a second phase of AlTaO₄. With an equal amount of both tantala and alumina, the overall coating would have more than 50 mol% of the AlTaO₄ phase. The ratio may also be such that a smaller amount of alumina is provided (the

Application/Control Number: 10/621,719

Art Unit: 1775

ratio may go as low as no alumina added) whereby the balance of the coating may be considered tantala.

The instant claims refer to tantala as being a choice of the balance of the coating.

Regarding the CTE, the coating of Chakrabarti is composed of a similar material as that of the claims, and would therefore be fully expected to possess commensurate properties.

Regarding claims 7, 8, 11, 16, and 17, the 50:50 ratio would be fully expected to yield a composition having 100% AlTaO₄.

Regarding claims 9 and 10, the method by which the coating is made is not considered a structural limitation. Furthermore, the coating of Chakrabarti may have a 50:50 ratio, which meets the limitation of the claim.

Regarding claim 18, the substrate the coating is deposited on may be silicon based.

Claims 1, 2, 6-18, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Matsudaira (US 4,670,355). Matsudaira teaches a coating comprising tantala and alumina in a ratio of between 50:50 and 95:5 by weight. With an equal amount of both tantala and alumina, the overall coating would have more than 50 mol% of the AlTaO₄ phase. The ratio may also be such that a smaller amount of alumina is provided (the ratio may go as low as 95:5) whereby the balance of the coating may be considered tantala. The instant claims refer to tantala as being a choice of the balance of the coating.

Regarding the CTE, the coating of Matsudaira is composed of a similar material as that of the claims, and would therefore be fully expected to possess commensurate properties.

Regarding claims 7, 8, 11, 16, and 17, the 50:50 ratio would be fully expected to yield a composition having 100% AlTaO₄.

Regarding claims 9 and 10, the method by which the coating is made is not considered a structural limitation. Furthermore, the coating of Matsudaira may have a 50:50 ratio, which meets the limitation of the claim.

Regarding claim 18, the substrate the coating is deposited on may be silicon based (quartz).

Claims 1-22, and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Li et al (US 2002/0136835). Li teaches a coating for a silicon bases substrate. The coating includes tantala and alumina. The Ta₂O₅ may incorporate up to 50 mol% of alumina so that the majority (at least 50%) of the phase in the coating becomes AlTaO₄, and the CTE matches that of the substrate. Specifically, if the substrate is SiC, the CTE is about 4-5 x10⁻⁶ C⁻¹ (paragraph 17). Li teaches that alumina may be the only additive provided with tantala. Li gives examples of formation of the AlTaO₄ coating in a manner commensurate in both method and composition to that of the instant specification. As such, it is fully expected to possess similar characteristics, such as AlTaO₄ phase formation, and CTE values. Furthermore, Li teaches a CTE in the same range as the instant claims. Li teaches a coating having a thickness of 1-50 mils, and specifically 2-10 mils.

Regarding claims 9, 10, and 39, the method by which the coating is made is not considered a structural limitation. Furthermore, the coating of Li is deposited in a manner similar to that claimed.

Regarding claims 18 and 19, the substrate may be SiC-SiC or SiN.

Regarding claim 22, the substrate is a gas turbine component.

Application/Control Number: 10/621,719 Page 6

Art Unit: 1775

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jennifer C. McNeil whose telephone number is 571-272-1540. The examiner can normally be reached on 9AM-6PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor,

Deborah Jones can be reached on 571-272-1535. The fax phone number for the organization where this
application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Jennifer McNeil April 30, 2005